



412
10-15-02
1632 R2

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM <i>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</i>	Application Number	09/900,700	
	Filing Date	July 6, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	Keith D. Allen	
	Group Art Unit	1632	
	Examiner Name	Paras Jr., Peter	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	3	Attorney Docket Number	R-616

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Robert J. Driscoll, Reg. No. 47,536
Signature	
Date	October 4, 2002

RECEIVED

OCT 11 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: 10/04/02			
Typed or printed name	Donald Mixon		
Signature		Date	10/04/02

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Keith D. ALLEN

Group Art Unit: 1632

Serial No.: 09/900,700

Examiner: Paras Jr., Peter

Filed: July 6, 2001

Attorney Docket No.: R-616

RECEIVED

OCT 11 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

For: TRANSGENIC MICE CONTAINING CRFR2 CORTICOTROPIN-RELEASING
FACTOR RECEPTOR GENE DISRUPTIONS

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office communication mailed September 4, 2002, concerning the Examiner's restriction of the claims, Applicant hereby provisionally elects, with traverse, Group III (claims 8, 10, and 17-22), drawn to a non-human transgenic animal comprising a disruption in a CRFR2 gene, a method of producing a transgenic mouse comprising a disruption in a CRFR2 gene and a transgenic mouse comprising a disruption in a CFRF2 gene.

In the restriction, the Examiner asserts that claims 1-23 are drawn to seven distinct subjects, grouped as: Invention I (claims 1-4), drawn to a targeting construct homologous to the CRFR2 gene and methods of producing the targeting construct; Invention II (claims 5-7 and 9), drawn to cells comprising a disruption in CRFR2; Invention III (claims 8, 10 and 17-22), drawn to a non-human transgenic animal comprising a disruption in a CRFR2 gene, a method of producing a transgenic mouse comprising a disruption in a CRFR2 gene and a transgenic mouse comprising a disruption in a CFRF2 gene; Invention IV (claims 11 and 12), drawn to methods of identifying agents that modulate the expression or function of CRFR2 by screening the agent in non-human transgenic animals and determining whether the expression or function is modulated; Invention V (claims 13-15), drawn to methods of identifying agents that modulate the expression or function of CRFR2 in a cell *in vitro*; Invention VI (claim 16), drawn to agents that modulate the expression or function of CRFR2; and Invention VII (claim 23), drawn to phenotypic data associated with a transgenic mouse, in a database. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement.

The Examiner asserts that the products of Inventions I, II, III, VI and VII are unrelated, each from the other, because the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects, and are thus patentably distinct inventions. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion in that the claims of Inventions I, II, III, VI and VII are related to one another. Therefore, a separate search or examination would not unduly burden the Examiner.

The Examiner further asserts that the claims of Inventions IV and V are patentably distinct inventions, having distinct purpose, distinct methodologies and distinct products. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion in that the claims of Invention IV and Invention V are related to one another, and therefore a separate search or examination that would seriously burden the Examiner would not be required.

The Examiner also asserts that the claims of Inventions I, II, III, VI and VII are patentably distinct from the claims of Inventions IV and V, as the inventions have different modes of operation, different function and different effects from the other. The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion, in that the claims of Inventions I, II, III, VI and VII and the claims of Inventions IV and V are related. A separate search or examination on these claims can be made without serious burden to the Examiner.

Although Applicant has provisionally elected Group III for purposes of advancing prosecution of the present application, Applicant contends, for the foregoing reasons, that the restriction requirement is improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4 October 2002


Robert J. Driscoll (Reg. No. 47,536)

DELTAGEN, INC.
740 Bay Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

(650) 569-5100

Enclosures